

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

Applicant has submitted a Replacement Sheet for Figure 13a. Originally filed Figure 13a included references to a Channel 3 and a Channel 4 that were both labeled "1360a". The specification makes it clear, however, that the reference to Channel 4 should be "1370a". A Replacement Sheet for Figure 13 provides for that correction.

Regarding references "1330" (page 28, line 32), "1331" (page 29, line 3), and "1332" (page 29, line 6), Figure 13b correctly refers to the references as "1330b", "1331b", and "1332b". The specification, however, did not include "b" after each of "1330", "1331", and "1332". Amendments to the specification are provided to address this issue.

Remarks

Applicant addresses each of Examiner's comments as follows:

1. Examiner has objected to the drawings as not including reference signs on pages 28-29. Applicant has submitted a corrected drawing sheet for Figure 13a and has amended the specification to address the remaining reference sign discrepancies.
2. Examiner has also noted that the references listed in the specification were not submitted in accordance with MPEP Section 609. Applicant has submitted an information disclosure statement that includes those references and respectfully requests consideration of those references.
3. Examiner objected to the abstract and specification on the basis of certain informalities. Applicant has amended the abstract and specification accordingly. Specifically, in response to Examiner's objection to the length of the abstract, Applicant has amended the abstract. Further Applicant has added a brief description of Figure 13b and a definition of DTMF to address Examiner's other objections. Regarding Examiner's objection to the lack of a definition of "DMA" on page 3, line 19, Applicant points Examiner to page 6, line 16 of the specification which defines the term "DMA" as "direct memory access". Applicant submits that this represents a sufficient definition of the term "DMA".
4. Examiner rejected all of the pending claims, except for claim 18, as being anticipated by, or rendered obvious by, U.S. Patent No. 5,724,356 (Parameswaran Nair et al). Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's

interpretation of the Nair reference. Nair discloses an entire hardware system comprised of numerous separate circuits, each comprising an uncertain number of processors. Unlike the present invention, Nair does not disclose a single system on chip architecture. For example, Nair recognizes that one portion of the "[d]ata pump circuit" is "a digital signal processor (DSP) which performs functions such as modulation, demodulation and echo cancellation of any signals received from telephone interface circuitry". Column 6, lines 6-8. At no time does Nair disclose an architecture that is implemented on a single chip. Rather, each of the functionalities cited in the present invention is implemented on different processors and in different circuits. Applicant has amended the independent claims to make the system on chip architecture more explicit. Because the Nair reference is simply inapplicable to the claims of the present invention, Applicant requests Examiner to withdraw its Section 102 and 103 rejections based on Nair.

5. With respect to the rejection of claim 18 under Kundu et al., applicant has cancelled claim 18, thereby rendering that rejection moot.

Applicant has addressed Examiner's formal and informal rejections and submits that the current application is now in a form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Hazim Ansari
40,896